

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because e.g. they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Murai (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,113). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither APA nor Murai, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests a coil bobbin including a core housing portion that includes spacing mechanisms formed on inner surfaces thereof, the core spacing mechanisms making contact with the magnetic core thereby generating spaces between the inner surfaces of the core housing portion and the magnetic core so as to control a position of the magnetic core, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action's assertion is that it would be obvious for one skilled in the art having a reference (Murai) that discloses ribs 7 at a first bobbin 3 that positions between the first bobbin 3 and a second bobbin 5, to combine that reference with a related art coil bobbin

having a magnetic core including two core sections, as disclosed in the application, and thereby to render the claims obvious.

As a preliminary matter, the Office Action's assertion fails because "the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." See MPEP 2143.01. Here, in the "Background of the Invention", the application describes a related art coil bobbin having a magnetic core including two core sections, and problems associated with the coil bobbin. For example, there is a dimensional change of the coil bobbin due to changes in the ambient temperature or humidity, for example, during varnish impregnation treatment, which causes force to act on abutting contact surface between two core sections, and thereby generating a gap therebetween. The "Background of the Invention", of course, is silent as to how to solve this problem.

Murai discloses a problem associated with transformer size. See, generally Murai's "Background of the Invention." Murai's solution is to combine a first bobbin 3 with a second bobbin 5 such that the first bobbin 3 surrounds the second bobbin 5. See col. 3, lines 11-13. One method of providing this configuration is to form ribs 7 at the inner surface of the first bobbin 3. See Murai's Fig. 3. In this manner, the transformer size can be reduced. Nowhere does Murai disclose, suggest or even provide motivation to use ribs to solve a problem as outlined in the "Background of the Invention" of the application.

In summary, there is no basis for why one skilled in the art would have modified the related art bobbin using the teachings of Murai to arrive at the claimed invention. In fact, it appears that portions of the disclosure of the "Background of the Invention" of the present application and the teachings of Murai were picked and matched, ignoring the context in which the respective bobbins were disclosed, to read on the claims. In this instance, the

motivation to combine the two references could only have derived from the teachings of the present application, which, of course, is impermissible hindsight.

Furthermore, the Office Action's basis for rejection of claim 1 also fails because the rejection is without merit. Specifically, claim 1 recites the core spacing mechanisms making contact with the magnetic core thereby generating spaces between the inner surfaces of the core housing portion and the magnetic core. As described above, Murai discloses at Fig. 3 a first bobbin 3 that surrounds the second bobbin 5 and the first bobbin 3 having ribs 7 formed at the inner surface of the first bobbin 3. Murai also discloses the second bobbin 5 surrounding ferrite (i.e., magnetic) cores 6. See Fig. 3. But nowhere does Murai disclose or suggest having ribs, such as the ribs 7 formed at the inner surface of the first bobbin 3, to form a space between second bobbin and the ferrite cores.

In fact, in Murai, inner fitting portions 6c of cores 6 are inserted into a fitting hole 5a of the second bobbin 5 such that no spaces are provided between the inner fitting portions 6c of the cores 6 and the inner surfaces of the second bobbin 5 as shown in Fig. 3, which definitely allows contact therebetween. Thus, Murai does not provide for advantages and benefits of the claimed invention, which, for example, prevents two core sections from shifting even when the bobbin is subject to dimensional change during varnish impregnation treatment.


Therefore, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 2-10 depend from independent claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter as well as for the features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/tea

Date: February 16, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461